A-17 com
RBR
G472

A

DEFENCE

OF

Dr. *SHERLOCK*'s Preſervative

AGAINST

POPERY,

IN

REPLY

TO A

Jeſuit's Anſwer:

Wherein the R. Father's Reaſonings are fully Confuted.

By *William Giles* a Proteſtant Foot-man, living with Madam *H.* in *Mark-Lane.*

The Second Edition.

London, Printed for *B. Aylmer*, at the *Three Pigeons* over againſt the *Royal Exchange* in *Cornhil*, 1688.

THE PUBLISHER TO THE READER.

I *Have heard it often observed, that it would be a Work worth any ingenious Man's pains, and very acceptable to the World, to take a View of the whole Controversie betwixt the Writers of the Church of* Rome *and us since his Majesties coming to the Crown; and to compare it with the Management of this same Controversie at the beginning of the Reformation, and through the late Reigns, I am assured it would make such a Discovery of the present Controvertists of that Church, as would make all them to blush that have any Modesty, and the World to blush for them that have none.*

It is very well known, that when the Reformation began, Learning was at a very Low Ebb, and they of the Church of Rome, *who were commanded to defend it against the Reformers, had a very hard Task of it, since they were engaged in matters wholly new to them; and, which was worse, in the Defence of a Cause which did want Arguments ten thousand times better than any could be gotten for it. However, to their Credit be it spoken, they undertook the matter fairly, and were so just to their Adversaries, as well*

in

as to their own Cauſe, as to anſwer Book with Book, and not to drop their Weapon, and run away after the firſt little Charge.

But we have a quite contrary ſort of Men to deal with now-a-days; they write as if the Controverſie had but juſt begun, and as if they had not read ſo much as their own old Authors; but after one little Effort, fall to Sheet and Half-ſheet Replies, as if they that furniſhed them with the firſt Book, could not have furniſhed them alſo with a Fair Reply. It is a very broad Sign that ſome Men came very unprepared to this Controverſie, and that it was a perfect Surprize to them, who dreamt ſurely of nothing leſs than of ſending and proving, they have been ſo untoward at it.

And this is that which hath made this preſent Controverſie ſo very miſchievous unto them; for ſome of their own Laity could not but own that the anſwering of large Books by Sheet, or a Half-ſheet, did not appear fair, but that it was very like it, if not a direct betraying of their Cauſe: And this was too apt to raiſe Suſpicions, either that their Prieſts could not defend their Cauſe, or that their Cauſe was ſuch as was not to be defended It were eaſie to give the Reader many Inſtances of this Kind: When the Six Conferences concerning the Euchariſt *were publiſhed, a Book written with ſo much ſtrength of Reaſon and Solidity, and which bore ſo very hard upon their great Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, as to undertake to demonſtrate that it did overthrow the Proofs of Chriſtian Religion; we might have expected that the* Romiſh Prieſts *would have been juſtly alarm'd at ſuch a Book of ſo threatning a Nature to their Darling Tranſubſtantiation, and would have employed the beſt Heads among them to anſwer ſo dangerous a Book; but as if they had all been aſleep, the World is preſented with a drowſie Half-ſheet at laſt againſt a Book of about eighteen Sheets; as if Yawning were to paſs for Anſwering.*

When

To the Reader.

When that excellent Book, The Second Defence of the Expoſition againſt the Biſhop of *Meaux* and his Vindicator *was Printed, and did ſo largely and ſo effectually prove all the former Charges againſt the wretched prevarications of that Biſhop, and his Vindicator; Was it not a very pleaſant thing to ſee a Sheet and a half Printed againſt it, with the pompous Title, of a full Anſwer to it? But I cannot be angry at the Man, for all the World is ſatisfied that he is ſick of that Controverſie; and that a Sheet and a half was enough in Conſcience for a man in his Condition. He did indeed about the ſame time threaten the learned* Author *of the* Diſcourſe againſt Extreme Unction, *with a Sheet againſt his Book; wherein he would take it to pieces: But I ſuppoſe he was half aſleep when he made that promiſe, and quite forgot it upon his firſt ſleep. It is ten to one, but ſome of their party will rouſe up this doughty Champion, and tell him, that now he may venture to write his Sheet againſt that Book, ſince there is no fear of an Anſwer from the* Author *of that* Diſcourſe, *who is now in his Grave: but if I might be of Councel to him, I would adviſe him to think twice before he ventures on his Sheet-Anſwer; for though the* Incomparable *and* never-to-be-forgotten *Dr.* Clagett, *the* Author *of that* Book *be (to our unſpeakable loſs) in his Grave, yet neither his* Book, *nor his* Memory, *nor his* Friends *are buried with* him; *and though that Book is more than able to defend it ſelf againſt ſo very weak an Adverſary, yet were it not, I am told, that let our Adverſaries begin as ſoon as they pleaſe, either againſt that or any other of his many* excellent Diſcourſes *againſt* Popery; *they will find, that there are too many* Friends to the Memory and Reputation *of that* Pious *and* Learned Champion *of the* Church of England, *to ſuffer any thing againſt* Him *to lye unanſwered: And I cannot fancy but ſome People are my humble Servants for this kind hint, who do not love to burn their Fingers.*

I will but mention one other instance of our Adversaries extravagant behaviour in this kind, against that Book, *the* Defence *of which I am intrusted to publish, the* celebrated PRESERVATIVE AGAINST POPERY: *how very acceptable to the World this* excellent Tract was, *the universal entertainment it met with, and the many thousands of it so greedily bought up, do sufficiently shew; how much the* Book *did in it self deserve all that kindness it found, every* Reader *will soon discover, that will but give himself the trouble to read any one page of it. I must confess, I have been mightily pleased, that our Adversaries themselves can find how very good a Book it is. I hear some of them rail unmeasurably at it, and are at a loss sometimes how to vent themselves more passionately against it: and this I take for as infallible a sign, that this Book is a very good one, as I would the least commendation of theirs, for its being a very dull one.*

This Book then, which the Commendations of all our own Church, and the bitter Revilings of some of our Adversaries have made so conspicuous, and attested its great worth, did deserve a very skilful Manager (if they must be answering it) to pull down all the worthy Doctor *had with so much Skill and Accuracy been building against them; did call for one who could answer with the same Solidity, Clearness and Wit that the* Doctors Book *had been written with. But as if this* Book *had been one of the dullest pieces that was published on our part, a* Jesuit, (*that is famous for something*) *is employ'd to answer it; and as if there had been no reason, nor sense, nor any thing for an Adversary to fasten upon in the* PRESERVATIVE, *the* Jesuit *gives us* an Answer *of a Sheet, as thinking that enough, or too much to employ against a* Book *that had nothing in it.*

But this Jesuit *is one of the most unlucky* men *that ever ventur'd upon* Controversie; *for as all the world did grant*

that

that this was a ridiculous Answer to so Great a Book, so it raised the Indignation of most Men against it, to see a Jesuit *trifling in a matter of so great concern, and nibling at a Book, the least Paragraph of which he is utterly unable to Answer. This is that, I believe, which provoked the* honest Footman *to Write this* Reply *to the* Jesuites Answer *to the* Doctors PRESERVATIVE; *for* he *found the* Jesuit *had Written in such a strain of Sense and Reason together, as if he had intended to enter the lists with some such Person as himself, and not with the* Excellent Master of the Temple: *and I do not wonder that the* honest Footman *could not resist the Temptation of catching the* Jesuit *at such an advantage, and of taking this so favourable an Opportunity of having a certain Victory over him; this would have tempted a more Learned Man, but I am well enough pleased that the honest* young Footman *has the glory of it.*

One would have expected that when the Jesuit *undertook to Answer so large a* Book *as the* Preservative *in so little room, he would have fallen immediately upon the Book he was Answering: but he it seems thought he had room to call others to account too in that small compass; and does very severely fall upon all our* Reformers *in general, as well as* some Authors *alive in particular.*

The Honest Footman *does confine himself in his* Reply *to the* Defence *of the* PRESERVATIVE *it self, and lets the* Jesuites Preface *alone, as nothing to the purpose indeed there: but I am willing to have a word or two with him about it, and see how the* Reformers *and those Men are concerned here in an Answer to Dr.* SHERLOCKS PRESERVATIVE.

The Jesuit at first dash accuses our Reformers of falling presently [*when they set up for opposers of* Popery] to forgeries, cliping of Texts, Fathers and Councils:

but forgets in his fury to give the Reader one instance of any Forgery, *or* cliping *of* Text, Father *or* Council. *He should not have forgotten to have done this, since the World will be ready enough to believe that it was not for any good will that he did omit them, but that all the reason was, that though he had malice enough to accuse them of it, yet that he wanted means to prove it upon them. But this accusation they find to be absolutely necessary, because our Men do so often accuse them of those very things, and they are not for being behind-hand in such charges, true or false it makes no matter, the thing must be done to keep off some way or other so severe a blow. The Accusations run high on both sides, and the Reader hath this certain way of knowing where the guilt lyes; that the* Church of Rome *accuse us, but do not prove it, but our Men do not only accuse them, but prove it upon them.*

For a clear Proof of this we need look no further than this Jesuit *himself, who of all Men living should have kept his Pen from such an Accusation, since he knows one that lyes under the severe charge of many such things. This very* Jesuit *is the Person so famous for the Controversie about a* Sermon *of St.* Austins *betwixt* him *and One of our learned* Writers, *who did not only prove that that* Sermon *which the* Jesuit *had quoted in a Prayer before* Sermon *was a Forgery, but that the Authors he brought afterwards to defend himself with, were neither better nor worse than down-right Forgeries; I have given my self the trouble for the worlds sake of examining that* Controversie, *and find that the* 14*th* Sermon de Sanctis *urged by the Jesuit is a* Forgery; *that the* 18*th of the same sort is a Forgery, that his* S. Hieroms Sermon * *was a Forgery, that his* Hephonsus *was a Forgery, that his* Mallion's Sermon *was a Forgery, that his* Story *about* Juvenal *and* Marcian *the* Emperour *was a Forgery.* *And*

* *See the First and Second Letters to* Lewis Sabran *Jesuit.*

And in a Controverſie betwixt theſe two, not above a month ago, about Invocation of Saints, *I find our* Author *charging the* Jeſuit *with the ſame things or worſe,* * *that his* firſt Author *was ſuppoſititious*; *that* he *had not only clipt* that Authors words, *but brought them in to prove that very thing, for the confuting of which the* Author *had* himſelf *intended them: that he had put down a* Prayer *to the* Virgin Mary, *as out of that Author, not a ſyllable of which was to be found there*; *that the* Jeſuit *had falſified his next quotation from S.* Cyril; *that his* Nectarius upon Theodore *was a Forgery*; *that his* Prayers *to the* Virgin Mary *from* Methodius, *from* Ephrem Syrus, *from* Athanaſius *and from* Leo *were Forgeries*; *that* Gregory Nazianzens *Prayer to* her *was a Forgery*; *that* his Proofs *from S.* Ambroſe, *from* Gregory Nazianzens Iambicks *were Forgeries*; *that his Proof from the* Council *of Chalcedon was clipt and abuſed*; *that his* Quotations *from the* Council *of* Laodicea, Gangræ *and* Carthage *were every one of them miſrepreſented, and abuſed*; *I muſt confeſs I was amazed at ſuch a* maſs *of* Forgeries *in ſo little room, and could not have thought it poſſible that any Man that pretends to the leaſt knowledge in Books could be guilty of ſuch things, much leſs that this very* Jeſuit *could have been the Man, who is ſo very ready to accuſe others (though moſt falſely) of it.*

* *See the Third Letter to Sabran the Jeſuit.*

He next falls upon particular men, and begins with Dr. Cosin, *whoſe Book he ſays, was firſt* ſet forth by him in the time of the pretended Plot, *and is ſo full of* falſe Quotations, *that they* can be produced by Dozens.

But theſe things ſhould not have been aſſerted ſo boldly, for the Author *of* that Book *printed it firſt in* 1674. *which is four years ſooner than our Jeſuit (who it ſeems knows better than he) will have it*; *and a* third Edition *of it with all the* Quotations, *was Licenſed before the end of* 1676.

1676. *As for the* dozens of false Quotations *which the* Jesuit *says are in that Book; let him produce them assoon as he pleases, I can assure him, he shall not fail of an Answer, not only to them, but to those* two *his Friend the* Representer *hath already attackt.*

As for the Answerer *to the* Address, *whom the* Jesuit *next tells us was run down for an* ignorant Scribler, *I will only tell him, that the* Addresser *may very quickly hear from that* worthy Person; *who will convince them both, that we have no bad Cause to defend, and that he is no unskilful Defender of it.*

And now the Jesuit *is got to Dr.* Sherlocks Preservative, *where I shall take leave of him, and commit him to the Honest Footman, who does here undertake him; but before I conclude this, I think it fit to give the Reader some account of the* Defence *of the* Doctors Book *against the* Jesuit, *which I am here publishing.*

It was brought to my hands by the young man himself, who had been directed to me by a Friend. The reasons of his writing it, and encountering the Jesuit, I believe I have guessed before; and those that will peruse the Jesuits Paper, will I question not, be of my mind. He did with a great deal of Modesty, commit it to my Disposal; I told him I would Print it, since I was very well satisfied with it. However, that the Reader may suspect no fraud nor foul play, I do profess here upon the word of a Christian, that I have committed it to the Press as it was delivered me by the young Man himself, in his own hand-writing, without the addition, or taking away of one word, or altering one Sentence or Line, so that the Reader will have it just as I had; excepting the falseness of the English, which is pardonable enough in a poor Servant, that was very young deprived of his Parents, and never had more Learning than to read English: however, upon this, I order'd the Bookseller to speak to his Com-

To the Reader.

Compositor *at the Press, to correct the English as he set it.*

I hope none will be angry that I encourage so mean a person so far, as to help his Book to the Press against the Jesuit, *none of our Church will be angry, and none of theirs ought, since they should remember, it is not so long since, that one of their Foot-Soldiers was for fighting a Pen-duel with the* Reverend *and* very Worthy *Dr.* Tenison, *(whom the* Jesuit *in this* very Paper *could not avoid Slandering) and published a thing called a Book against that worthy person: the inequality betwixt whom is, I take it, far greater than betwixt my* Writer *and the* Jesuit: *and there is another greater difference in the business; for my man treats the Jesuit throughout with respect, and gives him no ill Language: Had the other done so, it would as I conceive, have been no disparagement either to his Cause, or his Profession.*

And so I commit the Book to the Perusal of the Reader, whose favour I will not bespeak for it, since it is so able to speak for it self, and will only wish it good speed.

Post-

POSTSCRIPT.

I Muſt not forget to advertiſe the Reader, that as to thoſe Quotations out of *Latin* or *Greek Authors*, which the Young Man is far from underſtanding, as he declares in his Book, and therefore might juſtly be ſuſpected to have been added by ſome other hand; (Upon my enquiry) He told me he had that from *Nicephorus*, out of the Preface to *White's Way to the Church*, and the reſt from *Alliaco*, *Scotus* and *Tonſtal* out of the *Book* it ſelf, *Digreſſion* 49th, *numb.*9. where I ſuppoſe any inquiſitive Reader may find them.

Imprimatur,

A *Defence* of Dr. *Sherlock's Preſervative*, &c.

May 2. 1688. *Guil. Needham.*

A

DEFENCE

OF

Dr. *SHERLOCK*'s Preservative

AGAINST

POPERY,

IN

Reply to a *JESUIT'S* Answer.

TO begin then with Dr. *Sherlock*'s Principles, which *overthrow all right use of common Sense*: For the first, the Answerer tells us it is *Page* the Third, and there I find the Doctor blaming the Church of *Rome for not suffering her people to Dispute their Religion, or to read Heretical Books, nay not so much us to look into the Bible it self*; which he Repeats thus, *They will not allow the reading Heretical Books*, leaving out what was said of the Bible, it being too hot for him; he could not deny the Fact, nor had courage enough to Defend it, but saith,

His reason cannot teach him how God should require the Reading of Heretical Books; and so takes it for granted, that all the Writings of our Divines are so, nay and the Bible it self too, if he will keep to the Doctors words. Well, but *there are some Ministers* (in the Moon possibly, for we cannot learn where) *that use all endeavours to hinder their Flock from hearing Catholick Sermons and reading Catholick Books.* Catholick Sermons, blessed be God, we do or may hear, every Lords day at least, yea and read Catholick Books too; ay! but he means *Roman Catholick Books* and *Sermons*, let it be so, and desire him to tell you who it is that ever forbid his People to hear a Sermon, or read one of their Books, I confess this ought to be done with caution, knowing we have to do with them who make it their practise to deceive. For my part I gladly profess my self a Member, though an unworthy one, of the Church of *England*, and hope God will ever give me Grace to do it: and I have, according to the liberty which God and that Church hath given me, read several Books, not refusing his Catholick ones, not being contented with an Implicit Faith, especially when I read in the Sacred Scripture a command, *to be ready to give an Answer to every one that should ask a Question of the Hope which is in us, to try the Spirits, and to try all things*, and the like; and I know not but I may still do the same, as that small allowance of time, which one in my circumstances can expect, will afford me, for as *Dionysius Alexandrinus* saith (*Niceph. l. 6. c. 8.*) 'He 'used sometimes to be occupied in reading the Writings 'and Treatises of Hereticks, though it something pol- 'luted his mind with touching their unclean Opinions, 'because he reaped this profit thereby, that he might 'the easier refell them, and the more execrate and de- 'test them.

Pre-

Preſervative againſt Popery, *p.* 4.) ‘ Ask them whether ‘ they will allow you to judge for your ſelves in matters ‘ of Religion, if they will not, why will they trouble you ‘ with diſputing, you cannot be convinc'd unleſs you judg ‘ too, and thereby reſolve Faith into a private Spirit. — ‘ Here let our Proteſtant fix his Foot, and not ſtir an inch ‘ till they diſown Infallibility; and confeſs, that every ‘ man can and muſt judge for himſelf, in matters of Re- ‘ ligion, according to the proofs that are offer'd to him.

Anſwerer, This is to ſay, *'Tis impoſſible to convince a man that in reaſon he ought to ſubmit his Judgment to that of any other, though Infallible.* But how doth this Inference follow, it appears plain and natural to me, that I may ſubmit my Judgment to an Infallible Judge, and yet the Church of *Rome* may not be that Judge; muſt I ſubmit my Sence and Reaſon to be govern'd by the Pope, or elſe own it impoſſible to be convinc'd by Reaſon that I may do it to an Infallible Judge. Upon my word, Sir, if you will but prove your Church Infallible, I'le immediately forſake that Church which at preſent I think my ſelf very happy in, for yours. Doth this pretty Logic, as you call it, make void all the right uſe of common ſence and reaſon, when it ſhould lead us to ſubmit to any juſt Authority? ſurely no, but argues that we may make uſe of them to judge betwixt a juſt Authority and an Impoſture that uſurps that name. The Doctor doth not take the *Jews part againſt St.* Paul, nor bid us not harken to him till he diſown *Infallibility*; 'tis the product of your own brain: when you can give us ſuch proofs for your Infallibility, as he did, we ſhall own it, till then, we are content to be in the number of your Hereticks.

Preſervative, *Fol.6.* 'What difference is there between 'Mens uſing their private Judgments to turn Papiſts, or to 'turn Proteſtants? The Anſwerer tells us, *Page* the 4. *That 'tis the ſame as between two ſick Men, the one whereof chooſes to put himſelf in an able Doctors hands, whom he knows to have an Infallible Remedy, whilſt the other chooſes his own Simples, and makes his own Medicine.* Well, and is not here private Judgment uſed all this while? doth not he that puts himſelf into this able Doctors hands, uſe his private Judgment as well as the other? and is not the Doctor as much obliged to him for it; for if he did not uſe his Judgment how could he find out this able Doctor, or know that he had an Infallible Remedy? So that what Dr. *Sherlock* ſaid is true, 'That you are as much 'obliged to private Judgments for your Converts as 'Proteſtants can be.

Well but now, he tells us, the Doctor takes the Catholick's part, and though faintly, yet ſpeaks well in ſo clear a cauſe, (Preſervative, *Fol.* 9.) 'The intention of 'theſe Diſputes, is only to lead you to the Infallible 'Church, and ſet you upon a Rock; and then it is very 'natural to renounce your own Judgment, when you 'have an Infallible Guide. But now for convincing Reaſons againſt this plain Truth, as he calls it; the firſt is as he repeats it thus, *They cannot with any ſence Diſpute with us, about the particular Articles of Faith, becauſe the ſence given of Scripture and Fathers takes its Authority from the Church underſtanding it ſo.* This he is pleaſed to ſay, *is falſe; the ſence takes it's Authority from God who ſpake that Word. But how if that ſence be not there? Yes, the Spirit of God is to abide with her* (i. e. *the Church of* Rome) *for ever,* John 14.16. *and ſo ſhe cannot err.* I wonder how our Adverſaries can ſo palpably wreſt ſuch Texts, eſpecially conſidering that they have ſo often been told of it by

by our Divines. But to return, the Doctor having said, 'That if we should admit of the former Plea, that then 'first, it puts an end to all the particular Disputes of Reli- 'gion between us and the Chuch of *Rome*; we may Di- 'spute on about an Infallible Judge, but they cannot with 'any sence Dispute with us about the particular Articles 'of Faith, such as Transubstantiation, the Sacrifice of 'the Mass, the Worship of Images, and the like; for 'these are to be learnt only from the Church, and can- 'not be proved by Scripture or Fathers, without the Au- 'thority of the Church. But you see how he pares the words, and to show you that this Charge is true, I shall only mention something upon the first Point, *viz.* Tran- substantiation, out of their own Writers, and though I never read their Books, nor do understand any other Language than my own, yet I am so sure that they are honestly quoted, that I challenge any Romanist to prove the Contrary. *Petrus de Alliaco* the Cardinal saith, (4. *V.6. Art.2.f.*) 'That manner which supposeth the substance 'of Bread to remain still is possible, neither is it contrary 'to reason, or to the Authority of Scripture; nay it is ea- 'sier to conceive, and more reasonable than that which 'says the Substance doth leave the Accidents; and of this 'Opinion no inconvenience doth seem to ensue, if it could 'be accorded with the Churches determination. *Scotus* saith (*Script. Oxon.4. D.11. q.3. § quantum ergo ad istum*) 'Principally this seemeth to move us to hold Transubstan- 'tiation, because concerning the Sacraments we are to 'hold as the Church of *Rome* doth. And (*4.d.14.q.3. Bill. Enchar. L.3.C.23.* there is no Scripture to convince it, un- 'less ye bring the Church of *Romes* exposition. *Tonstal* 'saith (*de verit. Corp. & Sang. p.46.*) That it was free for 'all men, till the Councel of *Lateran*, to follow their own 'conjectures as concerning the manner of the Presence.

This

This shows upon what account Popery is believed, and with what respect they treat Scripture, making it in deed what they have called it, *A Nose of Wax*, that so it might be flexible to cover their Errors. Now if the sence they contend for cannot be proved from those Texts which they bring for it, nor is contained in Scripture, but that another sence may be had without any inconveniency; that is more easie to conceive, and more reasonable, but that the Church of *Rome* hath determined otherwise: Surely we may conclude, that the Scripture takes its Authority from the Church, understanding it so, seeing they believe it wholly upon that account, and would believe otherwise, were it not for that Reason.

Preservative, &c. fol. 11. 'Ask them whether the belief 'of an Infallible Judge must be resolved into every mans 'private Judgment? whether it be not necessary to be-'lieve this with a Divine Faith? and whether there can be 'a Divine Faith without an Infallible Judge? (Answerer p. 4.) *There can be no Divine Faith without a Divine Revelation, true; and therefore if you will have one with a Divine Faith, believe that there is an Infallible Visible Judge, nay, that the* Pope *is he, pray shew me a Divine Revelation for it.*

Answerer, p. 5.) *No understanding Protestant can be disputed into* Popery, *which owns an Infallible Church*, &c. But the Doctors words are, *No understanding Protestant can be disputed into this kind of* Popery, i. e. *That the Church is Infallible, and that the Church of* Rome *is that Infallible Church, and then gives his Reasons; first, no arguments can give me an infallible certainty of the Infallibility of the Church.* (f. the 17.) Now what saith the Answerer; why hear him, *We saw Dr.* Sherlock *just now* plead-

pleading for the Jews againſt St. Paul, *now he Reaſons even againſt Chriſt our God bleſſed for evermore* (juſt alike indeed Sir) *his words prove that Chriſt who own'd himſelf Infallible, did imprudently ſo* Preach *or work Miracles* ---- *Arguments ſo offenſive to pious ears* (mentioned 2 *Tim.* 4. 3.) *ought to meet with no other Anſwer than Prayers for him who offers them.* And doth this indeed follow from the Doctors words? is the compariſon all one between your Reaſons and Arguments, for your Churches Infallibility, and thoſe which Chriſt offered with the addition of Miracles? And yet though he was Infallible, and did work Miracles to confirm his Doctrine, he did not command them to be content with an Implicit Faith, but the contrary, *Search the Scriptures*, John 5. and 39. and *Mark* 12. and the 24. tells them, *They erred not knowing the Scriptures.* Beſides, Sirs, could there not be a true certainty without Infallibility? doth Dr. *Sherlock* ſay, *That the Jews could not be Diſputed into Faith, unleſs that Faith were Infallible?* no, he leaves that to be talked of by you who are the great pretenders to it.

Ibid. 'It is impoſſible by Reaſon to prove, that Men 'muſt not uſe their own Reaſon and Judgment in matters 'of Religion. (Anſwerer, *That Men muſt uſe Reaſon to come to the Knowledge that God hath revealed what they believe is very certain* ----- *But after that there is no further uſe of Reaſon, if we believe St.* Paul, *but in order to the bringing into Captivity all underſtanding into the obedience of Chriſt*, 1 of *Corinth* the 10. his meaning is, that he will allow you to uſe your Reaſon, ſo long as it leads you to the Church of *Rome*; but if once you find any thing to cotradict that, you muſt immediately renounce it, and not expect Sence and Reaſon from an Infallible Church, which is above all that; but methinks if my

Sence

Sence and Reaſon will ſerve me to find out an Infallible Church, it is a little ſevere to renounce it when I come there. We do not find in Scripture that they did or were required to do thus, nay the contrary, and yet ſure the Apoſtles were as Infallible as the Church can pretend to be now, 1 Epiſtle of *John* 4. 1. *Believe not every Spirit, but try the Spirits whether they be of God.* 1 Corinth. 10. 15. *I ſpeak as to wiſe Men, judge ye what I ſay*; and *Acts* 17. 11. *We have this particular commendation of the* Bereans, *that they were more noble than thoſe of* Theſſalonica, *in that they received the Word with all readideſs of mind, and ſearched the Scriptures dayly, to ſee whether what they heard were conformable thereto or no.*

Preſervative, *&c. Fol.* 21.) 'We have as much aſſu-'rance of every Article of our Faith, as you have of the 'Infallibility of your Church; firſt, becauſe we are in ge-'neral aſſured that the Scripture are the Word of God. Anſwerer, *Hitherto there holds ſome parity, though but lame, but ſuppoſe it were entire, the Concluſion would be this, Catholicks ase as certain of the ſence of Scripture as Proteſtants are that they have the Letter.* But don't you forget, Sir, that Infallibility is the Point Diſputed, you ſay indeed you have it, but ye are Judges in your own Cauſe, none own it but your ſelves; but the Scripture all Chriſtians own to be the Word of God, yea and we have the concurrent Teſtimonies of all Churches that we have thoſe Canonical Books, and have we no better ground for our Belief in that Point than you have for the other, ſeeing you contradict and Diſpute againſt all man-kind, and are fain to take it upon your own word, with the wreſting of a Text or two to ſpeak for the Church of *Rome*, which is to have

have no other Limitation than to the Church Univerſal; but if your Church be not Infallible (which you know we ſay) what warrant can you have for the receiving of particular points of Faith, wholly becauſe ſhe teacheth them? Here if you are not ſound in the firſt point, all the reſt will tumble. But now Proteſtants have all the certainty imaginable for the Rule of their Faith, and for the particular points of it; becauſe they prove them from the Word of God, which is their Rule. But let us ſuppoſe a while that your Church were Infallible, what greater Certainty (for that is the point you know which the Doctor was upon) have you of it, than we have of any particular point of Faith? As for the Certainty of Reaſon and Argument, that we have, and would fain ſee you ſhew more; what we believe is according to Scripture, and doth not contradict either Senſe or Reaſon, nor any other Principle of Knowledge; which you know the People of your Church are not to ſtand upon; but to ſubmit to her teaching, let her teach how ſhe will, becauſe ſhe is ſuppoſed to be Infallible, though they have no greater certainty of it, than Proteſtants have for any ſingle point; which makes it ridiculous indeed, for any Man to forſake the Church of *England* for the Church of *Rome*, upon the account of greater Certainty.

Preſervative, *Ibid.* Seconly, *and in particular, we are aſſured that the Faith which we profeſs is agreeable to Scripture.* Thus far the Anſwerer: but the Doctor added, *or expreſly contained in it, and does not contradict either Senſe or Reaſon, nor any other Principle of Knowledge.* Now what ſaith the Anſwerer? why, *If he means that they have the ſame Proof for this, which Catholicks have for the Infallibility of the Church, that is, for the Being of that*

Church which declares her ſelf Infallible (for a Church erring in ſuch a point, would ceaſe to be the Church of Chriſt) then 'tis evidently falſe, ſince each Chriſtian in this Age hath the ſame Evidence of her being the Church of Chriſt, and of her teaching Truth, and conſequently of her Infallibility, which he hath of Chriſt, viz. *Propheſies, Miracles,* &c. *which no Proteſtant ſo much as challengeth for the certainty of the particular Senſe of Scripture; the ſame proofs which Catholicks have for the Infallibility of the Church,* that is, *for the Being of the Church:* This is a pretty conceit, *the Infallibility of the Church,* that is to ſay, *the Being of the Church;* Can't a Church be then without being Infallible? Well! but every *Chriſtian in this Age hath the ſame Evidence of the Church of* Romes *being the Church of Chriſt, and of her teaching Truth, and conſequently of her Infallibility, which he hath of Chriſt,* viz. *Propheſies, Miracles,* &c. And where I pray are theſe things? What! the Evidence ſo plain to all Chriſtians, and yet two parts of three that can ſee no ſuch thing? I confeſs, we have heard much of Miracles, but could never ſee any; if they have any, they are kept to themſelves: but 'tis no matter, for (as a late Author hath it) the greateſt Miracle is, that any man can believe them: I ſhall not repeat any; they are common enough; any one that hath a mind to a whole Book full, need but enquire for the *School of the Euchariſt,* and I believe he will have ſatisfaction.

Preſervative, *&c. fol.* 23.) *If you muſt not uſe your Reaſon and private Judgment, then you muſt not by any Reaſons be perſwaded to condemn the uſe of Reaſon.* This is a plain caſe; for as the Doctor adds, *to condemn is an act of Judgment:* But the Anſwerer ſaith, *All this might with equal weight be ſaid by a ſick Man, who diſſwaded from*

from chooſing his own Remedies, and deſired to ſend for a skilful Doctor, ſhould anſwer, 'Tis impoſſible by Reaſon to perſuade me not to uſe my Reaſon, in governing my ſelf by Reaſon, as my own Reaſon teacheth me; which would be to condemn Reaſon, and yet be guided by your Reaſon; ſuch Diſcourſe would prove the Sick Man, at leaſt ſomewhat Light-headed. What 'tis a Symptom of in Dr. *Sherlock*, his Modeſty will not let him be poſitive in. But, Sir, Is this ſame Sick Man, when he is deſired to ſend for ſome able Doctor, perſuaded too to renounce his Reaſon, or rather, is it not that he ſhould ſubmit his Judgment (not renounce his Reaſon) in that caſe, to that Perſon whom he hath all the reaſon in the World to believe, hath better knowledge and underſtanding of thoſe things which are to be us'd for his Recovery than himſelf? And all this while, methinks he is govern'd by Reaſon, though he doth not think fit to truſt his own Skill; 'tis the Doctor's Profeſſion to know what Medicines are fit to be uſed in ſuch and ſuch Caſes and Conſtitutions, which I never trouble my ſelf about, and therefore ſurely I may be govern'd by him, without renouncing my Reaſon; nay, 'tis Reaſon that makes me do it. But this bears no Compariſon; Religion is, or ought to be the concern of all; Phyſical Speculations, thoſe only who are pleaſed to make it their Study: Every one muſt believe for himſelf, but every one is not obliged to be his own Doctor.

Preſervative, *&c.* fol. 25.) *We muſt allow of no Reaſon againſt the Authority of plain and expreſs Scripture.... We may reaſonably conclude, that God underſtands the reaſons and nature of things better than we.* This the Anſwerer ſaith, is a *very true and Catholick Principle.* Whence we may infer, That when the Doctor comes to apply

it, that he will be guilty of ſome moſt Illogical Inference. Alas for Dr. *Sherlock!* who can hold no Catholick Principle, but what muſt have ſome Illogical Inference attending it to ſpoil all; but let's hear it: *Thou ſhalt Worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve, is ſuch a plain and expreſs Scripture, that no Reaſon can juſtifie the Worſhip of another Being.* And what ſaith the Anſwerer to this, ſure ſome great matter, ſince he prepared his Reader before-hand with a *Behold? Why 'tis like this, A Subject muſt love his King, and owe Allegiance to him alone; therefore no Reaſon can juſtifie the love of a Child for his Father, or of a Wife for her Husband.* What a delicate piece of Sophiſtry is here! But 'tis no matter, his deſign is to confound us unlearned Hereticks: But Sirs, the Command is, to *ſerve God only*; which Service, we muſt of neceſſity underſtand to be that which is Divine; but worſhip is ſo: wherefore it irreſiſtibly follows, that we muſt not Worſhip any other Being, but what we are here commanded to ſerve, which is, *God alone:* So your ſimilitude will not hold. I am to love my King, (and I thank God I do it heartily) and to owe all Allegiance to him, but I may love another to whom I owe no Allegiance; but to Worſhip a Being, I can't without ſerving that; Being wherefore the Text is plain againſt the Worſhip of any other but God.

Preſervative, *&c.* fol. 26. *and in the Anſwer,* page 6. *The ſenſe of the Law is the Law—— but when the Law is not capable of a different ſenſe, or there is no ſuch* Reaſon *as makes one ſenſe abſurd, and the other neceſſary, the Law muſt be expounded according to the moſt plain and obvious ſenſe of the words.* Anſwerer; *This Principle is ſound.* You may then be ſure of a falſe Inference at the heel of it, juſt as before. Surely this Gentleman is one of

of *Momus*'s Race, whom nothing could pleaſe. They write of him, Thot none of the Gods could do any thing but he had a quarrel at it; when *Neptune* had made a Bull, *Vulcan* a Man, and *Minerva* a Houſe, he quarell'd at the Bull becauſe the Horns ſtood on his Head; the Man, becauſe he had not a Window in his Breaſt; the Houſe, becauſe it ſtood not upon Wheels, to remove it when it ſtood not well; and when *Venus* walked by, ſmiling at his conceit, he told her, ſhe was not well made neither; and her Shoes made too much creaking as ſhe went. But for the Doctor's falſe Inference; and this is it, *Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf any Image*, &c. which is ſo expreſs a Law againſt Image-Worſhip, that no Reaſon muſt be admitted for it; and what hath he to ſay to this? Why, there are two Queſtions which he thinks cannot be Anſwer'd, but that the Doctor's falſe Inference will appear,: Firſt then, *What if you be told, that although the Jews had perhaps a Command of making no graven Image*, &c. *yet this being a poſitive Law, and not confirmed in the Goſpel, doth not oblige us? Will this reaſon be admitted? No; and yet you have no other motive to paſs by as expreſs a Law of Sanctifying* Saturday. And do you indeed Sir, think it all one? Is it not held on all hands, that the keeping of the Seventh day was Figurative, and ſo aboliſh'd at the Death of Chriſt? But ſo far as it was Moral, namely, that a Seventh day ſhould be kept, that ſtill remains. Beſides, were we, or Chriſt and his Apoſtles, Authors of this change?, Chriſt as he roſe on that day, ſo he did uſually appear on that day to his Diſciples: And doth not the Scripture maintain the Celebration of it by the conſtant practice of the Apoſtles, *Acts* 20. & 7. 1 *Corinthians* 16. & 21. which ſhews, that we have better foundation for our Belief in this point, than you who rely on Tradition. Well!

but

but suppose it be rejoyn'd, that only the making to themselves (by private Authority) an Idol to adore it with Divine Worship is forbidden, can none of these Reasons be heard? no; then Bezelcel *by God's command, making several likenesses of things on Earth,* Solomon *placing such in the Temple, sinned against the First Commandment—— The truth is, what sense they put on any Text, is the express Law, against which, no Reason must be heard; so they challenge to themselves the Infallibility which they so sturdily deny to the Church of God.* For Answer to this then, first, we do not challenge the Infallibility which the polluted and degenerate Church of *Rome* (which he calls the Church of God) claims: For she would have us take the sense of any Scripture upon her own word; and because she so teacheth, we must submit to her definitions; and for this reason, Because she hath defined them: 'Tis not for private Christians to examin particular points of their Faith or Religion; no, 'tis sufficient to submit to an Infallible Guide; and that too, if he declares as the Council of *Constance* did, *Session* 13. concerning the Eucharist, *That notwithstanding our Lord did institute it in both kinds, and the Apostles so celebrated it, yet now it should not be so*; which was confirmed by the Council of *Trent*, Sess. 21. But for us Protestants, we cannot think that any Reason can be sufficient to lay aside an express Text. Well, but how shall we excuse *Bezeleel* and *Solomon* from sinning against the First Commandment? Why truly that is very easie; for 'tis plain, that they did not make them for any Religious Worship, neither did they pay any Adoration to them. And what comparison this hath to the Practice of the Church of *Rome* at this day, I shall leave to any Man who hath any knowledge of their Religion, to judge.

And

And now (in good time) he tells us he will conclude the Doctor's admirable Principles and Inferences (i. e. *that make void all right uſe of common Senſe and Reaſon*) with one ſo ſingular, that it deſerves to be obſerved by all: And truly it doth ſo, but it is of his own coyning; take it in his own Words, *page 6. No Argument from the neceſſity of a thing muſt be admitted to prove it is; if there be no Infallible Judge, there can be no certainty of Faith.* —— *Tho it be true, and you think it to be true, you muſt not allow this conſequence, therefore there is one.*——*Such Arguments do not prove that there be ſuch a Judge, but that there ought to be.* Now to ſee the Diſingenuity (to ſay no worſe) of this Author, we muſt look into the Doctor's Books, and there, (*fol.* 44.) he tells us, That *we ſhould never admit any Arguments merely from the uſefulneſs, conveniency, or ſuppoſed neceſſity of any thing to prove it is.* Now the Anſwerer leaves out the word *ſuppoſed*, and ſo makes that abſolute, which was only conditional, (*fol.* 45.) *if there be not an Infallible Judge, there can be no certainty in Religion:* This the Doctor ſaid; but for whom, I pray, for himſelf, or for the Roman Catholick? and therefore he goes on, *If I thought all this were true, (as I believe not a Word of it is) I ſhould only conclude, that it is great pity that there is not an Infallible Judge inſtituted by Chriſt: But if you would have me conclude from theſe premiſes,* Ergo, *there is an infallible Judge of Controverſies, I muſt beg your pardon for that; for ſuch Arguments as theſe do not prove that there is ſuch a Judge, but only that there ought to be one, and therefore I muſt conclude no more from them. Indeed this is a very fallacious way of reaſoning, becauſe what we may call uſeful, convenient, neceſſary, may not be ſo in it ſelf; and we have reaſon to believe it is not ſo, if God have not appointed what we think ſo uſeful,*

con-

convenient, and neceſſary, which is a truer and more modeſt way of reaſoning, than to conclude, that God has appointed ſuch a Judge, when no ſuch thing appears, only becauſe we think it ſo uſeful and neceſſary that he ought to do it: And now I would fain know who it is that denies Wiſdom and Reaſon in God.

And thus I have run through that Point, which the Anſwerer told us he would enlarge upon, *i. e. Reaſon*, which to defend Proteſtancy, we muſt make void, for ſo fam'd an Author as Dr. *Sherlock*, could not ſupport it, he ſaith, *without making void all Reaſon*, which Charge, how well he hath proved, the Reader is to judge.

To go on then, the Principles of Dr. *Sherlock*, which *make void all Faith*, follow next, which if I can but find, we are to take notice of; and I ſhall not ſay any thing to that long Harangue, which the Anſwerer makes, before he tells us where they be; not that I think it unanſwerable, but becauſe it is that which hath been ſo often anſwered by our Divines, and what they can ſay nothing to, but repeat over their old Objections again, that ſo, if poſſible, they might keep thoſe Learned Men from better Employment. For the firſt then, the Anſwerer tells us it is *fol.* 78. miſtaken for *fol.* 79. & 80. where the Doctor puts the caſe thus: *Suppoſe the Proteſtant Faith uncertain, how is the Cauſe of the Church of* Rome *ever the better? Is* Thomas *an honeſt Man, becauſe* John *is a Knave?* To this he anſwers, *That if* Thomas *and* John *be accuſed ſeverally of Theft, and the ſtoln Goods be found with* John, *I conceive, though this prove not* Thomas *ſo aſſuredly an honeſt Man, yet an honeſt Jury would, he conceives, bring him in* not Guilty. *That there is a true Faith, and conſequently a certain Rule*

of

of Faith all Chriſtians acknowledge, Proteſtants on one ſide chooſe one Rule, (how differently ever they apply it) Catholicks another; I conceive then if the Proteſtant Rule be proved uncertain, 'tis plain the Catholicks Rule muſt be the certain one. But for Anſwer to this conceit, which I confeſs made me ſmile at the Reading, and to begin with *John* and *Thomas* for the firſt, *The ſtoln Goods are found with him, and ſo he's Condemn'd; but now for the proof of that* Thomas *is an honeſt Man, and I ſee no neceſſity that he ſhould be ſo, unleſs there was nothing for him to ſteal but what* John *had got; nay, unleſs it be alſo proved that he had no hand in the taking of thoſe Goods which were found with* John, *which he might have, and ſo be equally guilty with him, notwithſtanding their being found with another. And ſo for Proteſtants and Roman Catholicks, one chooſe one Rule and the 'tother another; and ſuppoſe the Proteſtants Rule be proved falſe, doth it indeed neceſſarily follow that the Catholicks muſt be the true?* I conceive, Sir, that you muſt firſt prove that it is impoſſible for people to make to themſelves two wrong Rules, which I preſume will be labour. Suppoſe I ſhould tell you that there were two Men which were to go to ſuch a City or Town, but could not agree in their Judgments concerning the neareſt way which lead to it, and ſo took two ſeveral ways, and conclude, when one of them had been prov'd to err, that the way which the other took muſt be the neareſt way, which was to go to that City or Town, and ſo the true and right way: Would you not Anſwer me, That that did not follow, for there might be a third, and ſo a nearer than either of the former, and that they might both err; wherefore if you could prove the Proteſtant Rule uncertain, I do not ſee how it appears ſo plain, as you would perſuade me, that your Catholick one is the right.

What can be the Gentleman's meaning in his next affected Paragraph, I cannot conceive, unleſs it be this, *That becauſe Proteſtants take the Reaſons of their Faith from Scripture, and not from the Church of* Rome, *that therefore they can have no certain or Divine Faith,* which if it be, I pity him; if it be not, I muſt deſire him to explain himſelf.

Preſervative, *&c. ibid.*) *We believe the Apoſtles Creed, and whatever is contained in the Writings of the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles, and this is all we believe: And, I hope, they will not ſay that theſe things are uncertain.* Anſwer, *page 7. They are in themſelves very certain, but not to any Proteſtant, whoſe Rule of Faith cannot make him certain of any one Article*; this is pleaſant, theſe things are certain, but the Scripture, which is our Rule, cannot make us certain of any one Article contain'd in it; which ſhews demonſtratively upon what account they hold their Religion, and believe the Articles of their Faith, not becauſe they find them in Scripture, for that cannot make them certain that they are there, but becauſe their Church ſo teacheth, which is the thing he means; that God hath given ſufficient means to come to the knowledge of, if we would but uſe them: Well, but the Doctor's Anſwer, juſtifies Turk, Jew and Gentile, and how, I pray, do they believe all that is contain'd in the Writings of the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles which we do? and which you cannot deny, but with a little grumbling, becauſe we will not receive it upon the Authority of your Church, with thoſe additions which ſhe is graciouſly pleas'd to make.

Preſervative, *&c.* fol. 81.) *If theſe things,* i. e. *the Writings of the Apoſtles, &c. be not built upon certain Rea-*

ſons

sons, their Infallible Church can have no certainty of the Christian Faith. Answer, *this is most notoriously false, since she is not Infallible by any light of her own, but by the guidance of the Spirit of Truth. Were not the Apostles certain of what Christ told them, when they had acknowledg'd him the Son of God, before he gave them certain Reasons for it 'tis a blind Impiety even to think so.* Patience good Sir, and only be pleased to tell me whether therein were a certain Faith without certain Reason or no? As for what the Doctor said it is undoubtedly true, for as he saith but just before, *Infallibility cannot make that certain, which is in it self uncertain: an infallible Man must know things as they are, or else he is mistaken, and ceases to be Infallible; and therefore what is certain, he infallibly knows to be certain, and what is uncertain, he infallibly knows to be uncertain: for the most certain and infallible knowledge does not change its Object, but sees it just as it is.* Wherefore supposing your Church had the guidance of the Spirit of Truth to make her Infallible in all things, she must certainly see things as they are: wherefore the Scripture must be the Word of God, and what is therein contained certain, because she so Teacheth, or else she ceaseth to be Infallible.

Preservative, &c. *fol.* 82) *'Tis their common Argument, That there is a great variety of Opinions among Protestants, and that they condemn one another with equal confidence and assurance.* But the Answerer saith, he should have added, *Though they use the same Rule of Faith, and apply it by the same means, and that thus propos'd 'tis an unanswerable argument against our Rule of Faith, and evidently proves it uncertain.* Alas for us now, we are gone with a witness, our Rule being prov'd uncertain, we must certainly err if we rely upon it: yet chear up, we

have heard this unanswerable Argument Answer'd, particularly by the Reverend Dr. *Stillingfleet*, in his Answer to *J. S*'s Catholick Letters; but 'tis a Talent inherent in a Romanist, to repeat his old musty Arguments without taking notice of what hath been said in Answer thereto. But I must beg leave a while to look into the forenamed book, and there I find a full Answer to what is here said; *J. S.* having said, *That Scripture interpreted by private Judgment was not the way to know certainly what Christ and his Apostles taught, because they that made use of it that way did not agree, but differ'd in Fundamentals*, (In his First Letter). The Doctor Answers, *Fol.* 39. *Thus it doth not follow, by no means, that the Scripture is no certain Rule*; and he puts it thus, according to *J. S*'s Propositions, First, *Arithmetick prescribes a certain way by Addition and Substraction for us to find out any Sum.* Secondly, *Therefore it must be such, that they who take it shall arrive by it at the exact Sum.* Thirdly, *But two Men who have made use of the same way, differ at least a Hundred in casting up the Sum.* Fouthly, *Therefore Arithmetick doth not prescribe a certain way to attain at a certain Sum.* Fifthly, *Therefore they who take only that way, cannot by it arrive at the certain Sum.* But, saith he, *Fol.* 40. *those who consider a little better than Mr. S. hath done, will distinguish between the Rule and the Application of it; the Rule of Arithmetick may be nevertheless certain, although those who want skill or care and diligence, may mistake in casting up a particular accompt. The same we say here, Scripture is a certain Rule in all Fundamental Points, to such as have capacity, and use due care and diligence in finding them; but we do not deny but Men through prejudice, weakness, want of Attention, Authority of false Teachers, impatience of throughly examining things, and not using proper helps, may run into gross Errors*— But

Still

still the Rule is certain to those who use it aright. Fol. 41. *For although the Scripture be an infallible Rule, yet unless every Man that makes use of it be infallible, he may mistake in the application of it.* I desire the Gentleman to take this into Consideration, and if he think it not sufficient, to try his skill upon Dr. *Stillingfleet.*

Preservative, *&c. Fol.* 83) *Were all Protestants of a mind, would their Consent and Agreement prove the certainty of the Protestant Faith?* The Answerer saith, *Not at all, yet that it is a most ridiculous Inference of Dr.* Sherlock, *that this is the same Rule, and their Disagreement proves their Uncertainty; all Union is no Argument of the Spirit of God; for People may combine to do ill; yet S.* Paul *assures us, Disunion and Desertion is a certain Mark of the absence of the Spirit of God:* You should have added, in some, not in all the disagreeing Parties: For suppose, Sir, the Question be put among a Company of Men to go rob such a House, or kill such a Man; some of them consent to it, but there are others which will not; I desire to know, whether it be a mark of the absence of the Spirit of God in those which do not agree to do that Wickedness? And so you see what the Doctor's most ridiculous Inference comes to, and how he hath *made void all Faith.*

But now for Dr. *Sherlock*'s Position, which *makes void all Scripture-proof*, as it lies in the Answer, *page* the *7th. If a Mystery appear against Sense and Reason, we must have a Scripture-proof as cannot possibly signifie any thing else, or else it will not answer that Evidence which we have against it, Sense and Reason proving it naturally impossible. A Text,* he saith, *which cannot possibly have another Sense, doth not leave it in any ones Liberty, who owns Scripture, to*

be

be an Heretick; therefore the Church produced no such Text against the Arians *or* Nestorians; *whence it evidently follows, that according to Dr.* Sherlock, *the* Arians *and* Nestorians *were bound not to believe the Trinity, and the Incarnation of Christ. A Happy Ministerial Guide! And well led those that follow him!* And now, Reader, I must desire you again to look into the Doctor's Book, and read what he saith, and there I find that 'tis but *reasonable that the Evidence for it (i. e. Transubstantiation) should at least be equal to the Evidence against it, fol.* 70. *And therefore we must demand a self-evident Proof for this, because it is self-evident that* Transubstantiation *contradicts Sense and Reason, fol.* 71. And so he saith, fol. 72. *That we must demand such a Scripture-proof of Transubstantiation, as cannot possibly signifie any thing else, [without contradicting Sense and Reason, as that doth] or else it will not answer the Evidence which we have against Transubstantiation; for Sense and Reason pronounce Transubstantiation to be naturally impossible; and therefore, unless it be as impossible to put any other Sense upon Scripture, than what signifies Transubstantiation, as it is to reconcile Transubstantiation to Sense and Reason, there is not such good Evidence for Transubstantiation as against it.* With what Conscience now can any Man cavil at this, and say, *that it makes void all Scripture-proof?* As for the Trinity and Incarnation, which the *Arians* and *Nestorians* disputed, they are Mysteries indeed, and might seem to be above Sense and Reason, but they are not contrary to it; and it was not necessary to produce Scripture, which could not possibly signifie any thing else, that is to say, which could not possibly have any other Sense put upon them, without contradicting Sense and Reason; for they could not prove that those which were disputed did either. But now for Transubstantiation, that that doth,

doth both, is plain; wherefore 'tis but reasonable to desire a Scripture-proof that cannot signifie any thing else but Transubstantiation, without contradicting Sense and Reason, else, as the Doctor saith, *there is not so good Evidence for it as against it*; so that for ought our Author can say, Dr. *Sherlock* is a good Ministerial Guide, and those may be happy which follow his Guidance; when those who seek to pervert Souls, and bring them into a By-way of Darkness and Error, may be lamenting abus'd Mercy, and that they made no better use of that Talent which God had lent them.

Next comes the Doctor's Position, *making void all use of Holy Fathers and General Councils*, which to prove, the Answerer repeats by halves what the Doctor said, and then concludes, *That some of those Requisits not being possibly to be known, no use is to be made of any.* What Dr. *Sherlock* said is this; *That 'twas ridiculous for that man that hath been taught his Religion out of the Scripure, and which he might find there if he pleas'd, to change it for Quotations out of the Fathers and Councils which he did not understand, because some honest Priest (a sort of Men who never deceive any one) had told him that such a Father, who lived, it may be, they know not where nor when, and wrote they know not what, has spoke in favour of Transubstantiation, or Purgatory, or some other Popish Doctrin.* And then he comes to tell us what Questions we ought to ask, when we are urged with the Authority of Fathers, as, *How we shall know that such Books were written by that Father whose Name it bears? Whether it be uncorrupted? How we shall know the true meaning of those Words which they cite from them, which the Words themselves many times will not discover without the Context*, and the like, which requisites that Man who will build any

thing

thing upon their Authority, must know, or else he may be miserably mistaken; yet this is not to deny any use of Fathers and Councils; for Learned Men may dispute about them as they please; and I question not, if our Religion were to be try'd by the Fathers, but that we should undoubtedly carry it against the Church of *Rome*, notwithstanding all her Pretences to Antiquity; and yet we do not build our Faith thereon, but keep to that Rule which they had to walk by, which is the Word of God, contained in the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament.

And now I am arriv'd to the last Point, which our candid Answerer undertook, *viz.* to shew that Dr. *Sherlock made void all Moral Honesty*, and that he tells us lies in his last Chapter, where *to insinuate, that a Catholick thinks the Blessed Virgin more powerful in Heaven than Christ, he tells us, that he says ten* Ave-Maries *for one* Pater Noster. Well! for the Matter of Fact, that the Catholick doth say Ten Prayers to the Virgin, for one to Christ, the Answerer can't deny. Ay, but he doth not think her more powerful than Christ. Suppose that; yet sure he must think her more merciful, and readier to hear his Prayers than Christ, or else why is he so partial to pray Ten for One? which I doubt will prove much of a consequence with the former: And yet if the Doctor had not only done what he here persuades us he doth, but directly said it, I know not how he would have excused some of his own Party: And you know, Sirs, what the Author of the *Remarks upon the Reflections of the Author of Popery Misrepresented and Represented* hath undertaken. *viz.* this among many other things, to shew, when you shall desire it, that there are some of your own Writers, who believe the *Blessed*

sed Virgin to have as much Power in Heaven as her Son, and that maintains *the praying to her to command him, and begging from her pardon of Sins, and the assurance of Salvation.* To conclude, the Answerer tells us, that to be *thorough*-Sherlock, and *thorough-Protestant-Minister, he concludes with the most disingenuous Misrepresentation, and the most false Calumny imaginable, as a supposed and owned Truth,* to wit, *That Catholicks worship the visible Species in the Eucharist: A most impudent Slander,* he saith, *no Catholick being guilty of it, no more than the Apostles of worshiping and adoring the Cloaths of Christ, when they ador'd him upon Earth.* Preservative, *fol.* 89. *He* (Papist Represented) *believes it unlawful to commit Idolatry, and most damnable to worship any Breaden God, which,* saith Dr. *Sherlock, is spoke like a Protestant, but yet he pays Divine Adoration to the Sacrament, which is done like a Papist.* Here you see is no mention made of Species, but the word is Sacrament; and that they do pay Divine Adoration to that, they can't deny; but then they tell us, *That Christ is there, yea, that that Body which was born of the Virgin* Mary, *and that hung upon the Cross, Flesh, Blood, Bones and all is whole in every Point and Crum of the Consecrated Wafer; and that there remains nothing of the consecrated Elements; and that 'tis this their Adoration is paid to.* But surely now they had need to have good Grounds that this is so; this had need to be wonderfully clear in Scripture; and yet when they come to prove it thereby, they bring those Words, *This is my Body,* and conclude there is Foundation enough for all this, and much more, as if there were no Figurative Expressions in Scripture; and as if there were a necessity to take Scripture in a Sense which contradicts Sense and Reason, when another Sense more natural and easie may be had.

And now to cloſe up all with ſome good Advice for us Proteſtants, and that too in Dr. *Sherlock*'s Words, only putting the Word *Scripture* in lieu of *Fathers*, (a little Alteration, do not ſtand upon't; come, come, ſhew a little good nature for once, and take it upon my Word) *Amongſt Chriſtians there is not one in a hundred thouſand who underſtands all Scripture, and it is morally impoſſible they ſhould, and therefore certainly there muſt be an eaſier and ſhorter way to underſtand Chriſtian Religion than this, or elſe the generality of Mankind, even of profeſs'd Chriſtians, are out of poſſibility of Salvation: Think well on it, as you will anſwer at God's Tribunal for the Care you took of the one only Neceſſary, the ſaving of your Souls; ſeek out that eaſier and ſhorter way, and walk faithfully in it.* Good, ee'n cloſe your Eyes, and examin nothing, but come over to our Mother *Rome*, and be reſolute, and I'll warrant an happy Agreement. If this is not to be thorough Papiſt, and thorough Romiſh Prieſt, I know not what is: But to conſider it a little, though the truth is, it doth doth not deſerve it, all Scripture, yes, all Scripture muſt be underſtood, or elſe the Chriſtian Religion cannot: So that if a Man underſtood all the Texts of the Old and New Teſtament, except one, as for Inſtance, that in the *9th* of the *Revelations*, *verſe* the *14th.* he cannot underſtand Chriſtian Religion, and is out of a poſſibility of Salvation. This is a wonderful Diſcovery, and yet one would not think that it came out of a Jeſuits Forge; 'tis wrote ſo bunglingly, 'tis not done with Art enough to deceive, and ſo will not anſwer the Makers purpoſe: For as for us Proteſtants, I hope we are above ſuch little Shams; and we do not only ſay, but we find that Scripture in all Points neceſſary to Salvation is plain and eaſie; ſo that we may run and read: 'Tis true, there are ſome Texts, which we that

are

are unlearned, cannot readily find the true Senſe and meaning of; but they are not ſuch as immediately concern Salvation; and we are not deſtitute of Helps as to theſe; for we have learned and Religious Divines, whom we have all the reaſon imaginable to believe have no other Deſign upon us, than the *Good of Souls*, to whom we may have recourſe; and we always find them willing and ready to afford us their Aſſiſtance: So that to conclude, we are very happy where we are, and in a fair way to underſtand Scripture, tho it may be not every jot and tittle of it. However, I think it much better to know ſome, and ſo much as is ſufficient for my Salvation, than to go over to a Church which would have me ſtupify'd, and to underſtand none at all.

FINIS.

Some Books lately Printed for Brab. Aylmer.

A Treatiſe of the Pope's Supremacy: to which is added, A Diſcourſe concerning the Unity of the Church. By Dr. *Iſaac Barrow.*

A Diſcourſe againſt Tranſubſtantiation. By Dr. *Tillotſon.*

A Diſcourſe concerning the Adoration of the Hoſt, as it is Taught and Practiſed in the Church of *Rome.*

A Diſcourſe of the Communion in One Kind: In Anſwer to a Treatiſe of the Biſhop of *Meaux's.*

A Diſcourſe of the Sacrifice of the Maſs, in 4°.

A Diſcourſe againſt Purgatory.

An Anſwer to a Book Entituled, Reaſon and Authority: Or, the Motives of a late Proteſtant's Reconciliation to the Catholick Church. In a Letter to a Friend. Together with a Brief Account of *Auſtin* the Monk, and Converſion of the *Engliſh*, in 4°.

The Judgment of private Diſcretion in matters of Religion Defended; in a Sermon on 1 *Theſ.* v. 21. Preached at *St. Pauls Covent-Garden*, Feb. 26. 1686. By *Richard Kidder.*

A Requeſt to Roman Catholicks to Anſwer the Queries upon theſe their following Tenets: 1. *Their Divine Service in an unknown Tongue.* 2. *Their taking away the Cup from the People.* 3. *Their with-holding the Scriptures from the Laicks.* 4. *The adoration of Images.* 5. *The Invocation of Saints and Angels.* 6. *The Doctrine of Merit.* 7. *Purgatory.* 8. *Their Seven Sacraments.* 9. *Their Prieſts Intention in Baptiſm.* 10. *The Limbo of unbaptized Infants.* 11. *Tranſubſtantiation.* 12. *The Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Maſs.* 13. *Private Maſſes.* 14. *The Sacrament of Penance, &c.*

A Defence of the Ordinations and Miniſtry of the Church of *England.* In Anſwer to the Scandals rais'd or reviv'd againſt them in ſeveral late Pamphlets, and particularly in one, Entituled, *The Church of* England *truly Repreſented*, &c. in 4°. price 9 *d.*